arXiv:1511.03354v1 [math.NA] 11 Nov 2015

Approximate global minimizers to pairwise interaction problems via convex relaxation

Mahdi Bandegi* David Shirokoff†

November 12, 2015

Abstract

We present a new approach for systematically computing approximate global minimizers to a large class of pairwise interaction problems defined over probability distributions. The approach predicts candidate global minimizers, with a recovery guarantee, that are sometimes exact, and often within a few percent of the optimum energy (under appropriate normalization of the energy). The procedure relies on a convex relaxation of the pairwise energy that exploits translational symmetry, followed by a recovery procedure that minimizes a relative entropy. In the convex relaxation one obtains a linear programming problem over convex cones that is more efficient, in both space and time, to solve than semi-definite programming techniques. We demonstrate the approach in a periodic domain for examples arising from models in materials, social phenomena, flocking, or many particle physical systems. The examples are computed in dimensions one and two, and generate solutions with both discrete, continuous structures as well as lattices. The structure of the convex relaxation also yields an optimal dual decomposition for the interaction potential.

Keywords: Global minimizers, non-convex energy, pairwise interactions, convex relaxations, conic programming, semi-definite programming, flocking, self-assembly.

AMS Subject Classifications: 49M30, 49S05.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we present a new approach for computing approximate global minimizers (ground states) to large systems of particles interacting via pair potentials. The general idea is to avoid minimizing the non-convex pair interaction energy and instead minimize a convex energy that bounds the pairwise energy from below. Information from the solution of the convex lower bound problem is then used to navigate preferred directions in the energy landscape and recover a candidate minimizer. The minimum energy of the lower bound problem is then also used to provide a recovery guarantee, or bound, on the energy difference between the computed approximate minimizer and the true global minimum energy.

*Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, NJIT, Newark, NJ, USA, mb495@njit.edu
†Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, NJIT, Newark, NJ, USA, david.g.shirokoff@njit.edu

Although parts of the algorithm are numerical in nature, the approach produces an optimal analytic decomposition of the pair interaction energy into the sum of two separate parts: a non-negative (non-convex) interaction kernel and a convex interaction kernel. The decomposition leads to the emergence of new length scales that may play a role in further study of self-assembly problems and the characterization of matter. Specifically, the new length scales often determine the structure, i.e. support size and connectedness, of approximate global minimizers.

Pair interaction problems are ubiquitous throughout the sciences, appearing in problems ranging from electromagnetics , the weak interaction of nuclear matter [34], biological swarming [3, 4, 11, 26, 29, 44, 45, 46], colloids, polymers [10, 30], consensus [27], and self-assembly [18, 25, 32] to name a few. In these systems, each particle exhibits and experiences a *force* from every other particle in the system. The resulting sum of the pairwise energies then promote the collective organization of matter into the formation of structures such as solids or crystalline lattices [16, 39, 40, 41]. Global minimizers or ground states for many particle systems play a key physical role as they often describe the most likely observed state at low temperatures, or influence the structure of matter at larger temperatures. Determining ground states are also important for computing phase diagrams [13, 17]. Even simple attractive-repulsive pair interactions, however, may lead to non-trivial ground states, and a complete understanding of the interplay between interaction energies and resulting pattern formation is currently an open problem.

We consider problems with a large number $N \gg 1$ of particles, where a density $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ is used to represent the distribution of particles. For pairwise problems on a domain Ω, the particles interact with a total energy of the form

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) := \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{y}) W(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\rho(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \qquad \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1. \tag{1.1}$$

Provided the interaction energy $W(\mathbf{0}) < \infty$ is bounded at the origin, and symmetric $W(\mathbf{x}) = W(-\mathbf{x})$, the energy (1.1) can also be related to the conventional energy of a finite number of particles

$$\mathcal{E}_N(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N) = \frac{1}{2N^2}\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N W(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j). \tag{1.2}$$

For instance, substituting an ansatz of delta distributions into (1.1) yields:

$$\mathcal{E}_N(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N) = \mathcal{E}(\rho_N), \quad \text{where} \quad \rho_N(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_j). \tag{1.3}$$

Recently, computational methods based on convex relaxations or lower bounds have been used to estimate low energy states and phase diagrams in material science. For instance, [37] computed convex lower bounds to estimate the order-disorder phase transition in energy functionals containing double-wells. Meanwhile, [20] used relaxations to compute approximate density matrices for quantum systems at zero temperature, while [22, 23, 24] have computed molecular structures.

The approach we present for computing approximate global minimizers is similar in spirit to other state of the art algorithms currently used in optimization theory and integer programming that exploit matrix semi-definite programming (SDP) (see also [5, 14, 28] for a discussion on SDPs and relaxations). For example, semi-definite based convex relaxations represent some of the best known polynomial time algorithms for computing approximate solutions to the graph partitioning problem [15] and matrix completion problem (*Netflix prize*) [8]. They have also been used in data science to approximately solve the k-disjoint clique problem [2] and blind deconvolution [1], while other relaxations have been used to characterize the sparsest element in a discrete set [12]. Several difficulties however hinder the direct generalizations of known approaches based on SDPs to the computation of approximate global minimizers for pair interaction energies (1.1). Specifically, SDP type approaches to the pair interaction systems become prohibitively large, while the recovery procedure differs from other discrete problems in the literature due to the non-negativity constraint on $\rho(\mathbf{x})$. The approach we present is therefore not based on SDPs. Instead, we exploit translational symmetry in the energy (1.1), to devise a relaxation over a computationally simpler convex cone. The new approach yields a linear programming problem that is much faster to solve then an SDP in both time and memory. We then use a recovery procedure based on minimizing a relative entropy that naturally handles the non-negatively constraint on $\rho(\mathbf{x})$.

Our paper is presented as follows: section 2 introduces the general problem and definition of the recovery guarantee. In section 3 we formulate the convex relaxation while in section 4 we outline the recovery procedure. Section 5 contains a detailed description of the dual problem and resulting optimal decomposition of the pair potential energy. Section 6 contains numerical details, while 7 and 8 present numerical tests in dimensions one and two respectively. We demonstrate the approach for a variety of interaction kernels and obtain minimizers that are sometimes exact or within a few percent of the global minimum. Finally, appendix A contains information on known cases where the approach exactly computes the global minimum, while appendices B-C contain a discussion regarding the formation and recovery of discrete lattices in periodic domains.

2 Problem formulation and preliminaries

Consider a periodic domain $\Omega = [0,1]^d$ with dimension $1 \leq d \leq 3$, and interaction energy $W(\mathbf{x})$. We are interested in the problem of finding global minimizers to the pairwise interaction energy (1.1):

$$(P) \qquad \text{Minimize} \quad \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})W(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y},$$

$$\text{over probability distributions } \rho \in \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ with } \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1.$$

Here we have introduced $\mathcal{C}_1$ as the convex cone of non-negative probability measures[1]

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \{f \in C^0(\Omega)' : \langle f, u\rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } u \in C^0(\Omega) \text{ with } u(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0\}.$$

[1] Or more specifically, the dual space to continuous functions $C^0(\Omega)$ with a sup norm.

In the case when ρ is a classical function, we may equivalently replace $\mathcal{C}_1$ with $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. In the problem (P), we further assume that $W(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the following properties

(W1) Even symmetric: $W(\mathbf{x}) = W(-\mathbf{x})$, holds for all $\mathbf{x}$.

(W2) Continuous on Ω.

(W3) Periodic with period 1: $W(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{k}) = W(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and integer vectors $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

(W4) Normalized with mean zero: $\int_\Omega W(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 0$. Note that one can always add, without loss of generality, a constant to W. In such a case, the minimum to (P) is at most zero.

Remark 1. *For numerical simplicity we have intentionally limited the problem (P) to continuous kernels W on periodic domains Ω. Many of the results presented in this paper apply to other domains including $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ or the sphere, as well as kernels W, such as the extensively studied Coulomb potential [21, 33], which blows up at $\mathbf{x} = 0$.*

When the domain Ω is compact, such as the case at hand, the problem (P) admits a global minimum $\mathcal{E}_0 := \mathcal{E}(\rho_0)$, achieved by some probability distribution ${\rho_0}^2$. Note also that $\rho_0(\mathbf{x})$ is not unique since $\mathcal{E}$ remains invariant under translations so that any $\rho_0(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s})$ is also a global minimum. For non-compact domains, the existence and uniqueness [9, 38] (up to translations and rotations) of global minimizers is more subtle since mass can *explode* arbitrarily far apart.

Sufficient conditions for global minimizers ρ_0 of (P), (see also [4] for a discussion) are for the potential

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) := \int_\Omega W(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\rho_0(\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \tag{2.1}$$

to satisfy

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = 2\mathcal{E}_0, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \text{ in the support of } \rho_0(\mathbf{x}). \tag{2.2}$$

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) \geq 2\mathcal{E}_0, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \text{ where } \rho_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

The difficulty with equations (2.2)–(2.3), is that both $\mathcal{E}_0$ and the support of $\rho_0(\mathbf{x})$ are not known a priori. Thus, weakening the requirement in (2.2)–(2.3) by replacing $2\mathcal{E}_0$ with the requirement that $\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$ equals (or is greater than) an unknown constant results in the necessary first order Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT), and second order conditions.

A common practice in optimization theory is to guarantee that a candidate minimizer (or maximizer) is within a factor α of the optimal value. Here we say that an approximate minimizer $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ to problem (P) has an (α, ν) guarantee, where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\nu \geq \mathcal{E}_0$, if the shifted energy $\mathcal{E}(\rho^*) - \nu$ is optimal to within a factor of α:

$$(\mathcal{E}_0 - \nu) \leq \mathcal{E}(\rho^*) - \nu \leq \alpha(\mathcal{E}_0 - \nu).$$

[2]For instance, existence can be shown using a direct method from the Calculus of variations. The energy $\mathcal{E}$ is bounded from below, and due to the compact domain a minimizing sequence of measures $\{\rho_n\}$ is tight. Therefore by Prokhorov's theorem there exists a sub-sequence that convergences weakly to ρ_0 which, by the continuity of $\mathcal{E}$, has the same energy as the infimum.

In the context of gradient flows on $\mathcal{E}$, one may always add an arbitrary constant to the underlying potential $W(\mathbf{x})$, and hence $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$, without effecting the dynamics of $\rho(\mathbf{x})$. To eliminate the ambiguity of adding such an arbitrary constant, we introduce the shift $\nu = \mathcal{E}(\rho_{ref})$ as a reference energy with respect to a base probability ρ_{ref}.

Clearly, if $\alpha = 1$ with any ν then $\mathcal{E}(\rho^*) = \mathcal{E}_0$, and hence ρ^* is a global minimizer. In this case, we drop the notation ν and simply say the solution ρ^* is optimal with a guarantee $\alpha = 1$. In the numerical section of this paper we always report an α guarantee with $\nu = 0$. Due to the normalization (W4), $\nu = \mathcal{E}(1) = 0$ corresponds to a reference state of $\rho_{ref} = 1$.

In general, problem (P) is difficult to solve since the energy $\mathcal{E}$ is a non-convex functional of ρ. Instead we follow the general procedure:

1. Formulate a convex relaxation (R) of (P).
2. Solve the relaxation (R) using efficient linear programming (LP) algorithms.
3. Recover a candidate minimizer from (R) using minimal points of the Kullback-Leibler divergence. Report an (α, ν) guarantee for the candidate minimizer (with $\nu = 0$).

3 Convex relaxation

To obtain the relaxation, we first rewrite $\mathcal{E}$ by performing a coordinate change of variables in the integral. Letting $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s})W(\mathbf{s})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s} = \frac{1}{2}\langle F, W\rangle,$$
$$F(\mathbf{s}) := \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \rho \circ \rho.$$

Here we have introduced F as the auto-correlation of ρ, along with a shorthand binary operator notation $\circ$. In addition, $\rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{k}) = \rho(\mathbf{x})$ for all integers $\mathbf{k}$, is extended periodically through all space so that $\rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s})$ in the formula for $F(\mathbf{s})$ is well defined for any value of $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s}$. Lastly, $\langle f, g\rangle = \int_\Omega f(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$ is the standard $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product over the domain Ω.

The original problem (P) can then be understood as minimizing a linear functional $\langle F, W\rangle$, over the space of distributions $F \in \mathcal{A}$ that arise as the auto-correlations of probabilities:

$$\mathcal{A} := \Big\{F : F(\mathbf{s}) = \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}, \text{ such that } \rho \in \mathcal{C}_1, \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1\Big\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is not a convex space. Hence, we have reformulated the original problem (P) of minimizing a non-convex objective functional over a convex domain, to the minimization of a linear, convex functional over a non-convex domain. We now relax the admissible space of functions $\mathcal{A}$ to a convex set. Ideally, one would like to use the smallest convex relaxation, or convex hull of $\mathcal{A}$, however we use a larger space of convex cones that yields several nice properties.

We first observe that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1$ is contained in the cone of probabilities with area one since

- $\langle F, u\rangle \geq 0$ for any non-negative continuous function $u(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$.
- $\int_\Omega F(\mathbf{s})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s} = 1, \quad \forall\, F \in \mathcal{A}$.

We now define a second convex cone of distributions with non-negative Fourier cosine modes

$$\mathcal{C}_2 := \{ f \in C^0(\Omega)' : \langle f, \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\,\rangle \geq 0,\ \langle f,\ \sin(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\,\rangle = 0,\ \forall\, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathbf{0}\,\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Here the wavenumbers are vectors of non-negative integers

$$\mathbb{Z}^d_+ = \{(n_1, \ldots, n_d) :\ \text{for integers } n_j \geq 0,\ 0 \leq j \leq d\}.$$

Again $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2$ since any $F \in \mathcal{A}$ is an auto-correlation. This follows since for every $F \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a corresponding ρ with auto-correlation F so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&1.\quad \langle F, \sin(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle = \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\sin(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}))\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} = 0.\\
&2.\quad \langle F, \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle = \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}))\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y},\\
&\qquad\qquad = |\langle \rho, \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle|^2 + |\langle \rho, \sin(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle|^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define a new convex cone as the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2$. We then obtain a convex relaxation of (P) by extending the admissible distributions from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(R)\qquad &\text{Minimize}\quad \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega F(\mathbf{x})W(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},\\
&\text{over } F \in \mathcal{C},\\
&\text{where } \mathcal{C} := \Big\{F \in \mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 : \int_\Omega F(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

We note that the relaxation (R) is a conic linear programming problem since both the objective function and constraints are linear in F. Namely writing out the convex set $\mathcal{C}$ explicitly with linear constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
(R)\qquad &\text{Minimize}\quad \frac{1}{2}\langle F, W\rangle\\
&\text{subject to}\quad \langle F, \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle \geq 0, \qquad \langle F, u(\mathbf{x})\rangle \geq 0,\\
&\qquad\qquad\ \ \langle F, \sin(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle = 0, \qquad \langle F, 1\rangle = 1,\\
&\text{for all integers } \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathbf{0} \text{ and non-negative continuous functions } u(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We denote any solution to (R) as $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathcal{E}_R = \frac{1}{2}\langle F_R, W\rangle$, and immediately note that $\mathcal{E}_0 \geq \mathcal{E}_R$.

Remark 2. *The relaxation (R) may in some cases verify that a candidate distribution ρ^* solves (P). Suppose ρ^* is a probability distribution with auto-correlation F_R. Then ρ^* is the global minimum to (P). The result follows since any distribution is by definition larger than the minimizer $\mathcal{E}(\rho^*) = \mathcal{E}_R \geq \mathcal{E}_0 \geq \mathcal{E}_R$, forcing $\mathcal{E}_R = \mathcal{E}_0$ and (possibly non-unique) $\rho^* = \rho_0$.*

Remark 3. *To show $\mathcal{A}$ is not convex: take $f_1 = 1 + \cos(2\pi x)$, $f_2 = 1 + \cos(2n\pi x)$ for integer $n \gg 1$ on $\Omega = [0, 1]$. The convex combination of*

$$\lambda(f_1 \circ f_1) + (1 - \lambda)(f_2 \circ f_2) = 1 + \frac{1}{2}\cos(2\pi x) + \frac{1}{2}\cos(2n\pi x),$$

when $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ must come from auto-correlations (with arbitrary phases φ_1, φ_2) of the form

$$f_3 = 1 + \cos(2\pi x - \varphi_1) + \cos(2n\pi x - \varphi_2).$$

Choosing n large enough, the minimum value of f_3 regardless of the values φ_1, φ_2 can be made less that $\min_x f_3 \leq -\frac{1}{2} < 0$. Hence, there is no positive function f_3 with auto-correlation $(\lambda f_1 \circ f_1 + (1 - \lambda) f_2 \circ f_2)$.

Remark 4. *The set $\mathcal{C}$ with $\int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1$ contains elements that are not in $\mathcal{A}$. For example take $\Omega = [0, 1]$ and $F(x) = 1 + \cos(2\pi x) \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, only functions of the form $f(x) = 1 + \sqrt{2}\cos(2\pi x - \varphi)$, for any φ, have auto-correlations equal to F. Clearly, $f(x) \notin \mathcal{C}_1$, since f contains negative values and is not a probability distribution. Hence $F \notin \mathcal{A}$, showing that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$ is a proper subset.*



Figure 1: Illustration of the non convex set $\mathcal{A}$ (see remark 3) in relation to the convex relaxation $\mathcal{C}$ as a proper subset (remark 4).

4 Recovery through minimizing the Kullback-Leibler divergence

In this section we outline the procedure for recovering a candidate global minimizer ρ^* from F_R in two distinct cases when $F_R \in C^0(\Omega)$ is continuous (appendix C discusses a second case when F_R is a collection of Dirac-δ distributions). It is important to have algorithms that may

handle a variety of recovery cases since both $\rho \in L^1$ solutions, and solutions with singular support are of physical interest and studied in the literature.

In general, the relaxed space $\mathcal{C}$, and therefore solutions to problem (R) include distributions that are not auto-correlations of probabilities (see Remark 4). Hence, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$ is only a proper subset of $\mathcal{C}$ and as a result, the solution F_R may not come from an auto-correlation of a probability distribution.

The problem of recovering ρ^* from F_R is almost equivalent to deauto-correlating a function $F \in \mathcal{C}$, with the caveat that the source function ρ^* is *also* a probability distribution. The additional non-negativity restriction (i.e. $\rho^* \in \mathcal{C}_1$) distinguishes the phase recovery problem at hand from other phase recovery problems recently studied in the context of signal processing [6, 7, 8, 19, 42]. In our recovery process we follow a procedure introduced by Schulz and Snyder [35] (see also [36]) which chooses ρ^* as a minimizer of the Kullback-Leibler divergence functional (as known as the information divergence) between F_R and the auto-correlation $F_\rho(\mathbf{x}) = \rho \circ \rho$. As discussed in [35] (and references within) the information divergence functional has many nice properties for the recovery of non-negative signals making it a natural choice for the recovery of ρ^*.

4.1 Recovery when $F_R \in C^0(\Omega)$

Given a continuous distribution $F_R(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C} \cap C^0(\Omega)$, the Kullback-Leibler divergence is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := \int_\Omega F_R(\mathbf{x}) \ln\Big(\frac{F_R(\mathbf{x})}{F_\rho(\mathbf{x})}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega F_R(\mathbf{x}) \ln\Big(\frac{F_R(\mathbf{x})}{\rho \circ \rho}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}. \tag{4.1}$$

Here the admissible functions are $\rho \in \mathcal{C} \cap L^2(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega \rho\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1$ so that, by a standard Weierstrass test, the auto-correlations, $F_\rho = \rho \circ \rho \in C^0(\Omega)$ is a continuous function. In the definition of $\mathcal{F}$, one adopts the conventions:

$$0 \ln \frac{0}{a} := 0, \qquad 0 \ln \frac{0}{0} := 0, \qquad a \ln \frac{a}{0} := \infty, \tag{4.2}$$

to allow for both $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ and $\rho \circ \rho$ to vanish on some set.

Viewing both F_R and F_ρ as probability distributions, the Kullback-Leibler divergence defined by $\mathcal{F}$ measures the mismatch between probabilities F_R and F_ρ. Although $\mathcal{F}$ does not generate a metric between F_R and F_ρ, it is always non-negative $\mathcal{F}(\rho) \geq 0$ and dominates the total variation metric $d_{TV}(\cdot, \cdot)$ via Pinsker's inequality [31]:

$$d_{TV}(F_R, \rho \circ \rho) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}(\rho)}.$$

Hence $\mathcal{F}(\rho^*) = 0$ implies an exact recovery $F_{\rho^*} = \rho^* \circ \rho^* = F_R$, so that in this case ρ^* solves (P). Therefore, we recover approximate solutions to (P) as minimizers of $\mathcal{F}$.

To compute minimizers of $\mathcal{F}$ we use the Schulz-Snyder iterative algorithm[3], which is effectively a discrete power iteration on the space of non-negative probabilities. The advantage of

[3]In the original paper [35], the functional $\mathcal{F}(\rho) + \int_\Omega F_R(\mathbf{x}) - F_\rho(\mathbf{x})\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$ was used instead of $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$. Due to the fact that the Schulz-Snyder iterative algorithm conserves the constraint $\int_\Omega F_\rho(\mathbf{x})\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1$, the discrepancy in functional definition has no effect on the algorithm or results.

Continuous Recovery Algorithm (Schulz-Snyder)

1. Initialize $\rho_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ to be strictly positive with $\int_\Omega \rho_0(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1$. Ensure that ρ_0 has no planes of symmetry: for any fixed vector $\mathbf{a}$, the shifted ρ_0 is not even symmetric $\rho_0(\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{x}) \neq \rho_0(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{a})$.

2. Iterate the discrete mapping:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\rho_n(\mathbf{x})\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\rho}(\rho_n), \qquad\qquad \text{for } \mathbf{x}\in\Omega, \text{and } n = 1,2,3\ldots \\ &= \rho_n(\mathbf{x})\int_\Omega \rho_n(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})\frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_{\rho_n}(\mathbf{y})}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \\ \text{where}\quad & F_{\rho_n}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_n \circ \rho_n \text{ and we have used the fact that } F_R(\mathbf{y}) = F_R(-\mathbf{y}).\end{aligned}$$

3. Take $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_\infty(\mathbf{x})$ as the candidate global minimizer to (P).

---

the Schulz-Snyder algorithm is not only that it minimizes the information theoretical functional $\mathcal{F}$, but the iterations naturally enforce the probability constraints. As a result, the algorithm is very easy to implement.

Stable critical points to the functional (4.1) satisfy the necessary (first order) KKT conditions. Namely, for any mean zero perturbation $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ whose support is contained in the support of $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$, the first variation vanishes

$$\int_\Omega \mu(\mathbf{x})\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\rho}(\rho^*) = 0, \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\rho}(\rho^*) = \text{const.} \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{x} \text{ where } \rho^*(\mathbf{x}) > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

By direct calculation, the (unconstrained) L^2 variation of $\mathcal{F}$ is:

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) = -2\int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})\frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_\rho(\mathbf{y})}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \tag{4.4}$$

Hence, multiplying (4.4) by $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ and integrating over space yields the constant in (4.3). Critical points of $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying the first order (stable) KKT conditions are then concisely described by

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\rho}(\rho^*)\begin{cases} = -2 & \text{if } \rho^*(\mathbf{x}) > 0, \\ > -2 & \text{if } \rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \end{cases} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \rho^*(\mathbf{x})\int_\Omega \rho^*(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})\frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{y})}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}. \tag{4.5}$$

One may now view the Schulz-Snyder algorithm as iterates of the criticality condition (4.5). The algorithm also ensures the following properties

1. (Positivity preserving) $\rho_n(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}$ and $n \geq 0$.

2. (Mass preserving) $\int_\Omega \rho_n(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$.

3. (Monotonicity) $\mathcal{F}(\rho_{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{F}(\rho_n)$ for all $n \geq 0$.

4. (Fixed points) If ρ^* is a fixed point in the Schulz-Snyder algorithm, then ρ^* satisfies the KKT conditions (4.5).

Finally, as prescribed in step 1 of the Schulz-Snyder algorithm, it is important to avoid initializing the data ρ_0 to lie in any invariant subspace of the iterative map from step 2. Initializing the data ρ_0 to lie in an invariant subspace can potentially constrain the resulting fixed point minimizer ρ^* to have the same symmetry as ρ_0. The Schulz-Snyder algorithm has the following invariant subspaces:

- If $\rho_n(\mathbf{x}_p) = 0$ for some point $\mathbf{x}_p \in \Omega$ then $\rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}_p) = 0$.
- If for a fixed vector $\mathbf{a}$, $\rho_n(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) = \rho_n(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a})$ then $\rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) = \rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a})$.

The first symmetry regarding $\rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}_p) = 0$ follows directly from testing both sides of step 2 in the iterative scheme. The second property regarding planes of symmetry can be shown as well since both F_R and F_ρ are even symmetric about $\mathbf{0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) &= \rho_n(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) \int_\Omega \rho_n(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_{\rho_n}(\mathbf{y})} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \\
&= \rho_n(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) \int_\Omega \rho_n(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_{\rho_n}(\mathbf{y})} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \\
&= \rho_n(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}) \int_\Omega \rho_n(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{y}) \frac{F_R(\mathbf{y})}{F_{\rho_n}(\mathbf{y})} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} = \rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}).
\end{aligned}$$

5 The Dual decomposition

As a result of the convex cone constraints in (R), the dual problem (D) results in an optimal decomposition for $W(\mathbf{x})$ into the sum of a non-negative function, and a function with non-negative cosine modes. To motivate the dual formulation, first consider any decomposition for $W(\mathbf{x})$ that takes the form

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = W^+(\mathbf{x}) + K(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mathcal{E}_D, \tag{5.1}$$

where

- $0 \leq W^+(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega)$ is a non-negative function.
- $\int_\Omega K(\mathbf{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 0$ is mean zero, where $K(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega)$ has non-negative Fourier coefficients. Hence,
$$\int_\Omega \int_\Omega K(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \rho(\mathbf{x}) \rho(\mathbf{y}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y},$$
is a convex functional of ρ.
- $\mathcal{E}_D$ is a (negative) constant. Due to the normalization (W4), of $W(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{E}_D = -\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega W^+(\mathbf{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$.

Then any decomposition of the form (5.1) yields a lower bound $\mathcal{E}_D \leq \mathcal{E}_R$ to (R) since:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_R &= \frac{1}{2}\langle W, F_R\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(\langle W^+, F_R\rangle + \langle K, F_R\rangle\Big) + \mathcal{E}_D \geq \mathcal{E}_D, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

The last inequality follows since each pairing independently satisfies $\langle W^+, F_R\rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle K, F_R\rangle \geq 0$. The dual problem (D) to (R) is then formulated as optimizing (5.1) to find the *best possible* constant $\mathcal{E}_D$ and corresponding decomposition for $W(\mathbf{x})$ into the sum of a non-negative function and a function with non-negative Fourier modes:

$$\begin{aligned} (D) \qquad &\text{Maximize } \mathcal{E}_D, \\ &\text{subject to } \big(W(\mathbf{x}) - 2\mathcal{E}_D\big) \in \mathcal{C}_1^* + \mathcal{C}_2^*. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Here $\mathcal{C}_{1,2}^*$ are the dual cones[4] to $\mathcal{C}_{1,2}$, where the dual cone X^* to a convex cone X is given by:

$$X^* := \{x \in X' : \langle x, y\rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in X\}.$$

Meanwhile the sum $\mathcal{C}_1^* + \mathcal{C}_2^* = \{u + v : u \in \mathcal{C}_1^*, v \in \mathcal{C}_2^*\}$.

Since (R) is a linear problem, the duality gap is zero[5] and the solution to (D) is $\mathcal{E}_R$. We denote the corresponding optimal decomposition to (D) as $W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$ and $K_R(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}_2^*$ so that

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) + K_R(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mathcal{E}_R. \tag{5.4}$$

Remark 5. *The regularity of the optimal decomposition to (D) is an interesting problem: Numerical solutions in dimension one (see section 7) suggest that if $W(x)$ is smooth at x, then $W_R^+(x)$ and $K_R(x)$ are not necessarily smooth at x (although continuity of $W_R^+(x)$ and $K_R(x)$ has generally been observed).*

Remark 6. *Two simple examples of dual feasible decompositions are:*

Example 1: Take $\mathcal{E}_D = \frac{1}{2}\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega} W(\mathbf{x})$, $K(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and $W^+(\mathbf{x}) := W(\mathbf{x}) - 2\mathcal{E}_D \geq 0$.

Example 2: Write $W(\mathbf{x}) = K_+(\mathbf{x}) + K_-(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{E}_D$ as the sum of two functions where $K_\pm$ have only $\pm$ Fourier modes. Take $K(\mathbf{x}) = K_+$ to be the projection of W onto Fourier modes with positive coefficients, let $\mathcal{E}_D := \frac{1}{2}\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega}(W(\mathbf{x}) - K(\mathbf{x}))$ and take $W^+(\mathbf{x}) = W(\mathbf{x}) - K(\mathbf{x}) - 2\mathcal{E}_D \geq 0$.

[4]The formulation (D) is over $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2)^*$, however we use the fact that $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}_1^* + \mathcal{C}_2^*$.

[5]One can take finite dimensional approximations to (R) on equispaced grids with width h, which yield finite dimensional linear programs with optimal energies $\mathcal{E}_{R,h}$. Strong duality holds for linear programs and hence $\max \mathcal{E}_{D,h} = \mathcal{E}_{R,h}$ for every fixed h. Letting $h \to 0$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{R,h} \to \mathcal{E}_R$, and hence passing to the limit $\max \mathcal{E}_D = \mathcal{E}_R$.

5.1 Properties of the optimal dual decomposition

Revisiting the lower bound (R) and writing $W(\mathbf{x})$ using the optimal dual decomposition yields:

$$\mathcal{E}_R = \frac{1}{2}\langle W, F_R\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle W_R^+, F_R\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle K_R, F_R\rangle + \mathcal{E}_R. \tag{5.5}$$

Since both W_R^+, K_R are in the appropriate dual cones, the pairings $\langle W_R^+, F_R\rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle K_R, F_R\rangle \geq 0$. Therefore, (5.5) holds only if the integrals vanish

$$\langle W_R^+, F_R\rangle = 0, \qquad \langle K_R, F_R\rangle = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Furthermore, the constraint (5.6) also implies that F_R must have complimentary supports to W_R^+ in real space, and K_R in Fourier space. Indeed,

Case 1: When $F_R(\mathbf{x}) \in C^0(\Omega)$, and $W_R^+(\mathbf{x}), K_R(\mathbf{x}) \in L^1(\Omega)$, the dual decomposition satisfies

$$W_R^+(\mathbf{x})F_R(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \text{ a.e.,} \tag{5.7}$$

$$\hat{K}_R(\mathbf{k})\hat{F}_R(\mathbf{k}) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d. \tag{5.8}$$

Here

$$\hat{g}(\mathbf{k}) = \int_\Omega g(\mathbf{x})e^{-2\pi\imath\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}, \qquad g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{g}(\mathbf{k})e^{2\pi\imath\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \tag{5.9}$$

is the standard Fourier transform.

Case 2: When $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} f_R(\mathbf{s})\delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{s})$, is a collection of Dirac distributions:

$$W_R^+(\mathbf{s}) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \mathbf{s} \in S, \tag{5.10}$$

$$\hat{K}_R^\chi(\mathbf{k})\hat{f}_R^\chi(\mathbf{k}) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \mathbf{k} \in \hat{\chi}. \tag{5.11}$$

In this case

$$\hat{g}^\chi(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\chi} g(\mathbf{s})e^{-2\pi\imath\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{s}},$$

is the discrete Fourier transform over a lattice χ, and $\hat{\chi}$ is the finite set of discrete (reciprocal) wave vectors

$$\hat{\chi} = \{\mathbf{k} : e^{2\pi\imath\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{s}} = 1, \text{ for all } \mathbf{s} \in \chi\}.$$

Although F_R is a discrete collection of Dirac-δ's, W_R^+ and K_R are still functions on Ω, while the equations (5.10)–(5.11) are restrictions of (5.7)–(5.8) to the lattice. The values $\hat{K}_R^\chi(\mathbf{k})$ can also be obtained by restricting $K_R(\mathbf{x})$ to the lattice χ followed by taking the discrete Fourier transform.

The optimality conditions (5.7)–(5.11) suggest that low energy candidates $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$, will have auto-correlations F_{ρ^*} with support contained in the set where $\{W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ and Fourier modes $\hat{\rho}^*(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ whenever $\hat{K}_R(\mathbf{k}) \neq 0$.

6 Numerical formulation

In this section we present numerical details regarding the solution of (R) and dual decomposition (D). We discuss explicit details in dimension $d = 1$ and note that the extension to higher dimensions and geometries follows in a straightforward manner. The algorithm in this section does not exploit the Fourier structure of problem (R) however recent advances in optimization with Fourier constraints [43] can lead to further speed up which may be useful for computations in dimension $d = 3$. Finally we adopt the convention that vectors and matrices start with an index of 0 (as opposed to MATLAB) so that row indices coincide with Fourier mode numbers.

For the general problem (R) we discretize space with $n > 0$ points on an equispaced grid:

$$h = \frac{1}{n}, \quad x_j = jh, \quad \text{for } 0 \le j \le n-1.$$

The functions $W(x)$ and $F(x)$ are then taken as n dimensional vectors $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that:

$$\mathbf{w}_j \approx W(x_j), \qquad \mathbf{f}_j \approx F(x_j).$$

Constraints may then be constructed in a straightforward fashion as a subset of rows in the discrete Fourier transform matrices using the fast Fourier transform (FFT). First define the following $n \times n$ matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Non-negative constraint matrix:} \quad & \mathbf{P}_{lj} = -\delta_{lj}, && 0 \le l, j \le n-1, \\
\text{Cosine mode matrix:} \quad & \mathbf{C}_{l,:} = -\texttt{real(fft(}\mathbf{e}_l\texttt{))}, && 0 \le l \le n-1, \\
\text{Sine mode matrix:} \quad & \mathbf{S}_{l,:} = \ \ \texttt{imag(fft(}\mathbf{e}_l\texttt{))}, && 0 \le l \le n-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathbf{C}_{l,:}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{l,:}$ are the entire l^{th} matrix row, δ_{lj} is the Kronecker delta, and $\mathbf{e}_l$ is the l^{th} row of the $n \times n$ identity matrix:

$$\delta_{lj} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } l = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } l \ne j. \end{cases} \qquad \mathbf{e}_l = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By construction, the matrices have components $\mathbf{C}_{kj} = -\cos(2\pi kjh)$, $\mathbf{S}_{kj} = \sin(2\pi kjh)$ so that cosine and sine integrals are approximated via

$$-\langle \cos(2\pi kx), F(x) \rangle \approx h \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{C}_{kj} \mathbf{f}_j, \qquad \langle \sin(2\pi kx), F(x) \rangle \approx h \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{S}_{kj} \mathbf{f}_j. \tag{6.1}$$

To write the mass constraint in (R) explicitly, we also introduce the unit vector

$$\mathbf{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Finally, note that by symmetry, the bottom half of the rows in matrices $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ are redundant. It is therefore sufficient to enforce constraints for only the rows of l with $1 \le l \le \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ where

$$\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } n \text{ is even}, \\ \frac{n-1}{2} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}. \end{cases}$$

The problem (R) then takes the discrete standard form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(R_h) \qquad \text{Minimize} \quad & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{f} \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{P}\,\mathbf{f} \le 0, \\
& \mathbf{C}_{k,:}\,\mathbf{f} \le 0, \qquad 1 \le k \le \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, \\
& \mathbf{S}_{k,:}\,\mathbf{f} = 0, \qquad 1 \le k \le \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, \\
& h\,\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{f} = 1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Problem (R_h) is then solved using a standard linear programming package with an interior-point algorithm. We use MATLAB's `linprog` routine, with a tolerance set to 10^{-10}. In pseudo-code, the command takes the form:

$$[\mathbf{f}_R,\ \mathcal{E}_R,\ \mathbf{W}^+,\ \mathbf{K}] = \texttt{linprog}(\mathbf{w}, \textit{constraint matrices}\ \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{1}).$$

The output then consists of the optimal solution vector $\mathbf{f}_R$, the optimal solution value $\mathcal{E}_R$, as well as the dual decomposition vectors $\mathbf{W}^+$ and $\mathbf{K}$.

We identity two qualitatively different solutions $\mathbf{f}_R$ to problem (R_h):

Case 1. The solution $\mathbf{f}_R$ converges as $h \to 0$, to a $C^0(\Omega)$ function with no delta distribution singularities as $h \to 0$ (i.e. a solution with no singular support). In this case, the procedure from section 4.1 is used to recover a discrete ρ^* from $\mathbf{f}_R$. The vector ρ^* is discretized using n grid points on the same lattice as $\mathbf{f}_R$. The integrals in the continuous Schulz-Snyder algorithm are also computed using vectorized dot products (the standard midpoint rule is spectrally accurate for smooth solutions on periodic domains and lower order for non-smooth solutions F_R). The discrete ρ^* is computed to within steady-state tolerances tol_1, tol_2 so that the discrete quantities satisfy

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_n) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_{n+1}) < \text{tol}_1, \qquad ||\rho_{n+1} - \rho_n||_{L^1(\Omega_h)} < \text{tol}_2. \tag{6.2}$$

$$\text{where} \quad ||f||_{L^1(\Omega_h)} := h\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |f_j|. \tag{6.3}$$

Finally, the steady state vector ρ^* may have discontinuities. If required a filter can be used to remove Gibbs oscillations and improve convergence properties upon mesh refinement.

$$\tilde{\rho}^* = \texttt{ifft}\,(c_k\,.*\,\texttt{fft}\,(\rho^*)\,), \qquad \text{with } c_k = 1 - \frac{k}{n}. \tag{6.4}$$

Case 2. The solution $\mathbf{f} \to F_R(x)$ converges in distribution to a set of delta distributions as $h \to 0$. Namely, for any smooth function $u(x)$ and corresponding discrete vector $\mathbf{u}$, the value $h(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{f}) \to \langle u(x), F_R(x)\rangle$ converges as $h \to 0$.

Remark 7. *The quality of convergence, i.e. obtaining delta distributions in* $\mathbf{f}_R$ *with a support of one mesh point each, may be improved for solutions from case 2 by choosing the grid size* h *to naturally accommodate the spacings of the delta distributions with spacings that are multiples of* $1/p$ *(see Appendix B-C for a discussion on spacings of Dirac delta solutions). In other words, obtain a solution* $\mathbf{f}_R$ *(that may have distributions smeared over a few grid points) to* (R_h) *with a suitably fine mesh* h*. Estimate* p *in the set* χ *which is related to the distance between distributions in* $\mathbf{f}_R$*. Then take a new grid spacing* h' *such that* $1/(h'p) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *is a positive integer. Resolve the discrete problem* $(R_{h'})$ *using the new grid* h' *to obtain improved convergence. Improvements in the linear programming time were also observed when choosing a* natural *grid spacing* h'*.*

Remark 8. *In two dimensions, we found that solution* $\mathbf{f}$ *to the linear program* (R_h) *can become sensitive to the exact number* n*, the prescribed tolerance, and the allowable number of interior point iterations.*

Remark 9. *We systematically ran hundreds of recovery tests and found that the Schulz-Snyder algorithm always converged to the same value* $\mathcal{F}(\rho_\infty)$ *within numerical error. We did, however observe that when* F_R *was a discrete probability measure in two dimensions, there were multiple* ρ^* *that satisfied* $\rho^* = \arg\min \mathcal{F}(\rho)$*. The different* ρ^* *had almost the same recovery guarantees* α *to within* ± 0.02*.*

7 Results: examples in one dimension

7.1 A Morse-type potential

In this section we use our convex relaxation approach to generate candidate minimizers to a periodic Morse-type potential:

$$W(x) = -GLe^{-\frac{1}{L}|\sin(\pi x)|} + e^{-|\sin(\pi x)|} - \overline{W}, \qquad G, L > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{7.1}$$

Here $\overline{W}$ is always taken as a shift to ensure $W(x)$ is mean zero[6]. Replacing $\sin(\pi x) \to x$ in (7.1) recovers the conventional Morse potential, which is often used as a model for social interactions (see [4] and references within), aggregate models, and nuclear physics[7]. We systematically compute the minimizer F_R and recovered ρ^* for every value of (G, L). Figure 2 shows the phase diagram for the different qualitative behaviors of the recovered solution. Figure 3-4 show explicit results for a fixed value of $(G, L) = (0.9, 1.5)$ that lies in the region where F_R is a continuous function. The subfigure 3a demonstrates the convergence of the Schulz-Snyder algorithm, while 3b shows the Fourier support of F_R, K_R and ρ^*. An important observation is that the recovery algorithm attempts to minimize i) the support of $\hat{\rho}^*(k)$ in the region where $\hat{K}_R(k) \neq 0$, and ii) the support of $F_{\rho^*}(x)$ in the region where $W_R^+(x) \neq 0$ (see 4a). The recovered ρ^* has a guarantee of $\alpha = 0.994$ shown in figure 4b. Several characteristics

[6] For the Morse-potential, $\overline{W} = \int_0^1 -GLe^{-\frac{1}{L}|\sin(\pi x)|} + e^{-\frac{1}{L}|\sin(\pi x)|}\,\mathrm{d}x$.

[7] An alternative periodic Morse potential with qualitatively similar structure to (7.1) can be obtained via an infinite geometric series summation $W(x) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} W_M(x+n)$ where $W_M(x) = -GLe^{-|x|/L} + e^{-|x|}$, is the conventional Morse potential on $\mathbb{R}$.



Figure 2: Phase diagram for the periodic Morse potential (7.1). Structure of recovered minimizers ρ^*

naturally emerge from the recovery process: ρ^* has i) compact support with length 0.232, ii) discontinuities at the boundary of the support (the jump discontinuities in ρ^* are naturally recovered from the discontinuity in dF_R/dx), iii) substructures in the shape of *fingers*, which contain a length scale (distance between local maxima of ρ^*) of 0.077. The support size of ρ^* emerges as a new length scale - exactly 1/2 of the length 0.464 where $W_R^+(x) = 0$.

7.1.1 A discrete solution

In the upper left region of the phase diagram in figure 2, the periodic Morse potential exhibits discrete δ solutions for F_R. In some cases, the solutions are known analytically. For instance at parameters $(G, L) = (1.21, 0.5)$, the solution to (R) is

$$\begin{aligned} F_R(x) &= f(0)\delta(x) + f(2/5)\ \delta(x - 2/5) + f(3/5)\ \delta(x - 3/5), \\ f(0) &= \frac{1}{1 - \cos(4\pi/5)} = 0.55278\ldots, \quad f(2/5) = f(3/5) = \frac{1}{2}\big(1 - f(0)\big), \\ S &= \{0, 2/5, 3/5\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Restricting $W(x)$, to the lattice $\chi = \{0, 1/5, 2/5, 3/5, 4/5\}$ commensurate with S, the dual functions W_R^+ and K_R take (restricted) values

$$\begin{aligned} W_R^+(x) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.0116\ldots & 0 & 0 & 0.0116\ldots \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{for } x \in \chi, \\ \widehat{K}_R^{\chi}(k) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.1367\ldots & 0 & 0 & 0.1367\ldots \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{for } k \in \hat{\chi}. \\ \mathcal{E}_R &= -0.00852\ldots. \end{aligned}$$

The reconstructed ρ^* is then given explicitly by (up to translations)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^*(x) &= 1/2\ \delta(x) + 1/2\ \delta(x - 2/5), \\ F_{\rho^*}(x) &= 1/2\ \delta(x) + 1/4\ \delta(x - 2/5) + 1/4\ \delta(x - 3/5). \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$



(a) (b) $\hat{\rho}^*(k), \hat{F}_R(k), \hat{K}_R(k)$.

Figure 3: Results for the Morse potential (7.1) with $(G, L) = (0.9, 1.5)$, $n = 1024$ mesh. (a) Convergence versus iteration in the Schulz-Snyder algorithm: $\log_{10}\left(\mathcal{F}(\rho_n)\right) \to 1.384 \times 10^{-4}$ (dashed curve), $\log_{10} ||\rho_n - \rho_{n+1}||_{L^1(\Omega_h)}$ (solid curve). (b) Logarithm of the Fourier modes (FFT normalization convection) $\hat{F}_R(k)$ (green squares), $\hat{K}_R(k)$ (red circles), $\hat{F}_{\rho^*}(k)$ (black dots). Note $\hat{F}_R(k)\hat{K}_R(k) = 0$.



(a) $W_R^+(x)$, $K_R(x)$, $W(x)$. (b) $\rho^*(x)$, $\Lambda(x)$. (c) $F_R(x)$, $F_{\rho^*}(x), W_R^+(x)$.

Figure 4: Results for the Morse potential (7.1) with $(G, L) = (0.9, 1.5)$, $n = 1024$ mesh. (a) Optimal dual decomposition for $W(x)$ into $W_R^+(x)$ (blue curve), and $K_R(x)$ (red curve). (b) $\rho^*(x)$ (solid curve) with guarantee $\alpha = 0.994$, $\Lambda(x)$ (dashed curve, arbitrary units). (d) $F_{\rho^*}(x)$ (solid line), $F_R(x)$ (circles), $W_R^+(x)$ (blue curve), re-scaled for reference to show complimentary support.

7.2 A local potential

In the context of social interactions, recent work [27] has focused on a class of *local* kernels where the interaction $W(x)$ has compact support. In this section we examine the approximate global minimizers and dual decomposition for a continuous periodic version of the local potential examined in [27]:

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 0.1, & |x| \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ 9|x| - 4.4, & \frac{1}{2} < |x| \le \frac{3}{5}, \\ 1, & \frac{3}{5} < |x| \le \frac{9}{10}, \\ 10 - 10|x|, & \frac{9}{10} < |x| \le 1, \\ 0, & |x| > 1, \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{7.4}$$

$$W(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Big(\psi\Big(\frac{x+n}{l_c}\Big) - \overline{\psi} \Big).$$

Figure 5c shows the potential $\psi(x)$, which differs primarily from the one in [27] by replacing the discontinuous jumps (at range values 0.1, 1 and 0) by linear interpolation. The quantity $l_c > 0$ enters as the (dimensionless) ratio of the local interaction length to periodic domain length, with $W(x)$ entering in as a full periodic potential. One might expect in the limit $l_c \ll 1$ to recover the characteristics of the non-periodic model. For $l_c = 0.1$, which is commensurate with the periodic domain length, and $n = 360$ grid points, one recovers the auto-correlation with 10 equispaced delta-distributions

$$F_R(x) = \sum_{s \in S} f_R(s) \delta(x - s), \tag{7.5}$$

$$f_R(s) = \frac{1}{10}, \text{ where } S = \Big\{0, \frac{1}{10}, \frac{2}{10}, \ldots, \frac{9}{10}\Big\}.$$

Since $F_R(x) = F_R \circ F_R$, letting $\rho^*(x) = F_R(x)$ recovers the exact auto-correlation and hence is a global minimizer with guarantee $\alpha = 1$. Figure 5a shows the dual decomposition of $W(x) = W_R^+(x) + K_R(x) + 2\mathcal{E}_R$. Numerically, it is observed that both $W_R^+(x)$ and $K_R(x)$ are constant over the domain, so that they are effectively local potentials. As a final remark, if l_c is not taken as an integer fraction of the domain length, or the grid spacing $h = 1/n$, is not commensurate with the spacing of the delta-distributions, one may have more exotic minimizers, and care must be taken in examining the convergence of $F_R(x)$ as $h \to 0$.

7.3 A regularized power law potential

Power law potentials are often used in models of social dynamics. Here we illustrate the approach for a regularized power law potential on a periodic domain. Set

$$W_p(x) = x^{-0.4} - \frac{1}{3.5} x^{-0.2} - \overline{W}, \qquad x \in [0, 1]$$

$$W(x) = W_p(x + \epsilon) + W_p(1 - x + \epsilon), \qquad \text{for } x \in [0, 1], \text{ extended periodically.} \tag{7.6}$$

The exponents $-0.4, -0.2$ and parameter 3.5 are chosen arbitrarily to obtain a function $W(x)$ with order one variations on the periodic domain $[0, 1]$. The parameter $\epsilon = 0.01$ is taken to

regularize the discontinuity at $x = 0$. Without the regularization, the value $W(0)$ becomes undefined and the optimization routine in (6) must be modified to obtain a convergent minimizer to (R). As a note, the shape of the potential is somewhat sensitive to the parameters ϵ and deviations from the constant 3.5. The candidate minimizer $\rho^*(x)$ is shown in figure 6 and has a guarantee $\alpha = 0.9884$.



(a) $W_R^+(x)$, $K_R(x)$. (b) $F_R(x), F_{\rho^*}(x), \rho^*(x)$. (c) $\psi(x)$.

Figure 5: Results for local potential (7.4), $n = 360$ grid. (a) Optimal dual decomposition for $W(x)$ into $W_R^+(x)$ (blue curve), and $K_R(x)$ (red curve). (b) $F_R(x)$ (circles), $F_{\rho^*}(x) = \rho_*(x)$ (solid lines). The recovery is exact with $\alpha = 1$. (c) Local interaction potential $\psi(x)$.



(a) $W_R^+(x)$, $K_R(x)$, $W(x)$. (b) $\rho^*(x)$, $\Lambda(x)$. (c) $F_R(x)$, $F_{\rho^*}(x), W_R^+(x)$.

Figure 6: Results for regularized power law potential (7.6), $n = 1000$ grid. (a) Optimal dual decomposition for $W(x)$ (black curve) into $W_R^+(x)$ (blue curve), and $K_R(x)$ (red curve). (b) $\rho^*(x)$ (solid) with guarantee $\alpha = 0.9884$, re-scaled $\Lambda(x)$ (dashed) with arbitrary units. (c) Auto-correlation $F_R(x)$ (dots), and $F_{\rho^*}(x)$ (solid).



(a) $W_R^+(x)$, $K_R(x)$, $W(x)$. (b) $\rho^*(x)$, $\Lambda(x)$. (c) $F_R(x)$, $F_{\rho^*}(x)$.

Figure 7: Results for potential with multiple length scales (7.7), $n = 1024$ grid. (a) Optimal dual decomposition for $W(x)$ (black curve) into $W_R^+(x)$ (blue curve), and $K_R(x)$ (red curve). (b) $\rho^*(x)$ (solid) with guarantee $\alpha = 0.9882$, rescaled $\Lambda(x)$ (dashed) with arbitrary units. (c) Auto-correlation $F_R(x)$ (dots), and $F_{\rho^*}(x)$ (solid).

7.4 A potential with multiple length scales

Another interesting example occurs for potentials that promote several length scales by having multiple local minima in $W(x)$. As an example, take

$$\begin{aligned} W_t(x) &= \max\{1-x, 0\} - \overline{W}, && \text{for } x \in [0,1], \\ W(x) &= W_t\Big(\frac{x}{10}\Big) + W_t\Big(\frac{1-x}{10}\Big) - \frac{1}{2}\cos(4\pi x), && \text{for } x \in [0,1], \text{ extended periodically.} \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

Here $W_t(x)$ is a repulsive triangle potential which has non-negative Fourier modes. The $\cos(4\pi x)$ term is added to make $\mathcal{E}$ non-convex. We find a candidate minimizer $\rho^*(x)$ with a guarantee $\alpha = 0.9882$ (see figure 7).

Remark 10. *Other works, such as [4] have been successful in characterizing global minimizers under the assumption that ρ^* has connected support. The recovery process for potential (7.7) yields an F_R with disconnected support, thereby resulting in ρ^* with multiply connected supports.*

8 Results: examples in two dimensions

In this section we consider two dimensional examples for the periodic Morse potential.

$$W(x,y) = -GLe^{-\frac{1}{L}(|\sin(\pi x)|+|\sin(\pi y)|)} + e^{-(|\sin(\pi x)|+|\sin(\pi y)|)} - \overline{W}, \qquad G, L > 0, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{8.1}$$

The solution F_R is solved for different values of (L, R) and the recovery process is performed on the resulting F_R.

8.1 Continuous

For $(G, L) = (0.9, 1.5)$ we obtained a continuous $F_R(\mathbf{x})$. For the recovery process we ran 100 trials with random initial data and each time recovered the same $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$. The candidate $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ has a guarantee $\alpha = 0.9997$ and minimum value $\mathcal{F}(\rho^*) = 0.0011$. The solution $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ is shown in figures 8, which demonstrates i) compact support and ii) substructure spikes.

8.2 Discrete

For values $(G, L) = (1.5, 0.5)$, the solution $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ is a collection of discrete δ's. Figure 9 shows the support of $F_R(\mathbf{x})$, $F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$. The recovery successfully matches 93% of the support of $F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{x})$ with $F_R(\mathbf{x})$, however relative to the constant state $\rho(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, the guarantee is $\alpha = 0.538$.

9 Discussion and conclusions

Although our approach systematically generates candidate $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ which have excellent recovery guarantees, there are several important numerical observation that may help in future analysis of the problem.

- In many cases the support of $F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{x})$ is completely contained in the support of $F_R(\mathbf{x})$, however numerical examples such as the discrete two dimensional Morse potential show that this may not always be exactly the case.
- Although $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ are minimizers to the Kullback-Leibler functional, they may not exactly satisfy the KKT conditions for (P). Namely $\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$ may only approximately be constant over the support of $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$. The lower bound $\mathcal{E}_R$, still provides a reference value for the optimal ρ_0, and in the very least, the candidate $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ may provide an excellent starting value for a secondary minimization routine such as a constrained gradient flow.

In this paper we provide a new analytic approach for systematically computing approximate minimizers to a classical problem based on pairwise interactions. From a scientific computing point of view, the approach may be appropriately modified for *blackbox* global quadratic optimization solvers with non-negative constraints and circulant (or block circulant) matrices. The approach is significantly faster then straight-forward conventional semi-definite programming and may be combined with state of the art optimization routines with Fourier



(a) $F_R(x)$. (b) $\rho^*(x)$.

(c) $F_R(x)$. (d) $\rho^*(x)$. (e) $W_R^+(x)$.

Figure 8: Results for two dimensional periodic Morse potential $(G, L) = (0.9, 1.5)$, 40×40. (a) Continuous target auto-correlation F_R. (b) ρ^* with guarantee $\alpha = 0.999$. (c) Contour plot for F_R showing the support. (d) Contour plot of ρ^*. (e) Contour plot of W_R^+ with a black line indicating region where $W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

constraints. Moreover, exploiting the translational symmetry in problem (P) results in a conic programming problem that requires far less memory than semi-definite programming (SDP). For instance, a three dimensional discretization for (P) via an SDP with $n = 100$ grid points would yield a $10^6 \times 10^6$ dense matrix.

From a physical perspective, the dual decomposition provides new insight into the natural length scales for the support of $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ in both real and Fourier space. The dual decomposition is also valid for both the continuous problem (P) and minimizing the discrete energy (1.2).



(a) $F_R(\mathbf{x})$, $F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{x})$. (b) $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$.

(c) $F_R(\mathbf{x})$. (d) $F_{\rho^*}(\mathbf{x})$.

Figure 9: Results for two dimensional periodic Morse potential $(G, L) = (1.5, 0.5)$, 40×40 grid, discrete δ solutions. (a) Discrete F_R (black lines) and recovered F_{ρ^*} (blue circles). (b) Recovered support of a ρ^* (the support contains 0.9894 of the mass of ρ^* with guarantee $\alpha = 0.538$. (c) Support of F_R. (d) Support of F_{ρ^*}, the large circles account for a total mass of 0.9267, the small circles (each with mass < 0.006) account for the remaining mass. The KL functional is $\mathcal{F}(\rho^*) = 0.086$.

Acknowledgments: The author (DS) would like to thank Ihsan Topaloglu for many insightful comments regarding pairwise interaction problems. The authors have also greatly benefited from conversations with Rustum Choksi, Robert Kohn, Cyrill Muratov, Jennifer Park and Jean-Christophe Nave. This work was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#359610, David Shirokoff).

Appendix A: Cases where the lower bound (R) is sharp

There are several straightforward cases where the lower bound (R) is sharp, and the recovery ρ^* is guaranteed to be the exact global minimum - even when $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ is non-convex. In this section we outline the known cases where (R) is sharp, as well as cases that yield an exact recovery to $F_R(\mathbf{x})$. We also remark on the corresponding dual decomposition (D) in the known exact cases.

Proposition 9.1. *For a $W(\mathbf{x})$ satisfying properties (W1)-(W4), $\rho_0(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ is a global minimizer to (P) if and only if $W(\mathbf{0}) \leq W(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$.*

Proof. If $W(\mathbf{0}) \leq W(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, set $\rho_0 = \delta(\mathbf{x})$. Then for any probability distribution $\rho(\mathbf{x})$

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \int_\Omega W(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}, \tag{9.1}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2}W(\mathbf{0})\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{E}(\rho_0). \tag{9.2}$$

Hence ρ_0 solves (P). To show the converse, take $\rho_0 = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ as a global minimizer to (P) and assume by contradiction there exists an $\mathbf{s} \neq 0$ such that $W(\mathbf{s}) < W(\mathbf{0})$. Testing the energy with candidate $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta(\mathbf{x}) + \delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{s}))$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho^*) = \frac{1}{4}\big(W(\mathbf{0}) + W(\mathbf{s})\big), \tag{9.3}$$

$$< \frac{1}{2}W(\mathbf{0}) = \mathcal{E}(\rho_0). \tag{9.4}$$

Hence, ρ_0 cannot be a global minimizer and therefore $W(\mathbf{0}) \leq W(\mathbf{s})$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \Omega$. □

Remark 11. *What is interesting about proposition 9.1 is that the condition on $W(x)$ does not at all imply that $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ is a convex functional. As an example, take $W(x) = -\cos(x) - \cos(2x) + 0.1\,\cos(3x)$. Here $W(0)$ is the minimum value of $W(x)$ yet $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ is non-convex.*

The following simple proposition is known in the literature, however we repeat it here for completion.

Proposition 9.2. *$\rho_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ is a global minimizer to (P) if and only if $\langle W(\mathbf{x}), \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\rangle \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+$.*

Proof. If $\langle W(\mathbf{x}), \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}^* \cdot \mathbf{x})\rangle < 0$ for some $\mathbf{k}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = 1 + \cos(2\pi\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{k}^*)$ has energy

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho^*) = \frac{1}{4}\langle W(\mathbf{x}), \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}^* \cdot \mathbf{x})\rangle < 0 = \mathcal{E}(1).$$

Therefore the constant state is not the global minimum.

Alternatively, to show the converse first consider the energy $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ in the case when $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \in C^0(\Omega)$ is continuous: by Plancherel and Parseval's theorem

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{\rho}_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \hat{W}_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0.$$

Since $\langle W(\mathbf{x}), \cos(2\pi\mathbf{k}^* \cdot \mathbf{x})\rangle \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{k}$, $\hat{W}_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$ and hence $\mathcal{E}(\rho) \geq 0 = \mathcal{E}(1)$.

If ρ is a probability distribution, regularizing ρ_ϵ via convolution with a smooth bump function, will make ρ_ϵ a continuous function. Provided the bump function is smooth, the energy $\mathcal{E}(\rho_\epsilon)$ is then a continuous function of the regularization parameter ϵ. Passing to the limit

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}(\rho_\epsilon) \to \mathcal{E}(\rho), \quad \text{as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

Hence, $0 = \mathcal{E}(1) \leq \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ for all ρ. □

Proposition 9.3. *The lower bound (R) is sharp when $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ or $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ is a global minimum to (P).*

Proof. When $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, $W(\mathbf{x})$ has non-negative cosine modes. Over the space of continuous F, the lower bound problem functional in (R) is

$$\langle F, W\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{F}(\mathbf{k})\hat{W}(\mathbf{k}) \geq 0 = \langle 1, W\rangle = \mathcal{E}_0.$$

Hence $F(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ is the minimizer to (R) over continuous functions. Again, one can use a standard density argument to show that no other probability measure can have lower energy than $F(\mathbf{x}) = 1$. Hence, $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ solves (R). Alternatively, if $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ is a global minimizer to (P), $W(\mathbf{0}) \leq W(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Hence, for any probability distribution F:

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = \frac{1}{2}W(\mathbf{0}) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \delta(\mathbf{x}), W(\mathbf{x})\rangle \leq \langle F, W\rangle.$$

Therefore $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ solves (R) and is sharp.

In both cases, when $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ and $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$, the solution $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies $F_R \circ F_R = F_R$. Hence, taking $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = F_R(\mathbf{x})$, yields an exact recovery: $F_R = \rho^* \circ \rho^*$. □

Remark 12. *The cases discussed in proposition 9.3 result in simple optimal dual decompositions:*

- *When $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ solves (R), the optimal dual decomposition is*

$$W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad K_R(\mathbf{x}) = W(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathcal{E}_R = 0.$$

- *When $F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x})$ solves (R) the optimal dual decomposition is*

$$W_R^+(\mathbf{x}) = W(\mathbf{x}) - W(\mathbf{0}), \quad K_R(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \mathcal{E}_R = \frac{1}{2}W(\mathbf{0}).$$

Thus far, we have characterized simple classes of interactions $W(\mathbf{x})$ where the lower bound is sharp and the recovery process is exact. For some interaction kernels $W(\mathbf{x})$, the solution $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ is a uniform discrete lattice:

$$F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|\chi|}\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\chi}\delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{s}), \tag{9.5}$$

where $|\chi|$ is the number of points in the lattice. In this case, the recovery is also exact. For solutions of the form (9.5), $F_R \circ F_R = F_R$. Hence, taking $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = F_R$, satisfies $F_R = \rho^* \circ \rho^*$.

Appendix B: periodic effects and the discrete lattice

In this section, we examine a simple sub-class of minimizers $F_R(x)$ to (R) in one dimension. We show that within this sub-class, minimizers often have support commensurate with a discrete lattice. Consider the restricted set of probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \alpha\delta(x) + \beta\delta(x-s) + \beta\delta(x+s), \\ \alpha + 2\beta &= 1, \qquad 0 \le s \le \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

The subclass (9.6) is then completely characterized by two parameters (s, β). The lower bound problem (R) restricted to the probabilities (9.6) with three delta masses is:

$$(R_3) \quad \text{minimize} \quad \frac{1}{2}\langle W(x), F(x)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}W(0) + \beta\big(W(s) - W(0)\big).$$

We now outline why unique minimizers of the form (9.6) to (R_3) characterized by values (s^*, β^*) often have support commensurate with a lattice: that is $s^* \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a rational number.

First optimize the energy (R_3) at a fixed s over the weight β thereby yielding a function only of s:

$$E(s) := \frac{1}{2}W(0) + \inf_{\beta}\Big[\beta\,\big(W(s) - W(0)\big)\Big].$$

As a special case of proposition 9.1, if $W(0) \le W(s)$, then $E(s) = \frac{1}{2}W(0)$ and a unique minimizer must have $(s^*, \beta^*) = (0, 0)$. For $W(0) > W(s)$, $E(s)$ decouples into:

$$\begin{aligned} E(s) &= \frac{1}{2}W(0) + \theta(s)\big(W(s) - W(0)\big), \\ \theta(s) &:= \sup\beta, \quad \text{subject to} \quad (1-2\beta)\delta(x) + \beta\delta(x-s) + \beta\delta(x+s) \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

The function $\theta(s)$ is then computed explicitly by examining the convex cone constraint $F \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$\langle \cos(2\pi kx), F(s)\rangle = 1 - 2\beta + 2\beta\cos(2\pi ks) \ge 0, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Hence,

$$0 \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\cos(2\pi ks))} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

It follows that,

$$\theta(s) = \inf_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^+} \frac{1}{2(1-\cos(2\pi ks))}.$$

When the value of s is irrational, $\cos(2\pi ks)$ can be made arbitrarily close to -1:

$$\theta(s) = \frac{1}{4} \text{ for } s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \qquad \theta(s) = \min_{0\leq k\leq p} \frac{1}{2(1-\cos(2\pi ks))} \text{ for } s = \frac{q}{p} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

An immediate consequence is that $\theta(q/p) \geq \theta(s)$ for all $q/p \in \mathbb{Q}$ (rational) and $s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ (irrational). The function $\theta(s)$ also has interesting continuity properties:

Proposition 9.4. *The function $\theta(s)$ is continuous at all $s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$ and discontinuous at all $s \in \mathbb{Q}_o$, where $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_e \cup \mathbb{Q}_o$,*

$$\mathbb{Q}_e = \{q/p \in \mathbb{Q} : gcd(q,p) = 1, p \text{ } even\}, \qquad \mathbb{Q}_o = \{q/p \in \mathbb{Q} : gcd(q,p) = 1, p \text{ } odd\}.$$

Proof. For simplicity in the proof first introduce

$$\tilde{\theta}(s) := -1 \text{ for } s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad \tilde{\theta}(s) = \min_{0\leq k\leq p} \cos(2\pi ks) \text{ for } s := \frac{q}{p} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Since θ is a composition of a continuous function with $\tilde{\theta}$, it is sufficient to prove proposition (9.4) for the modified function $\tilde{\theta}$ instead of θ.

First we remark on the value of $\tilde{\theta}(q/p)$ for integers q, p with $\gcd(q,p) = 1$: there exists an integer $k^* > 0$ such that

$$k^*q \equiv \frac{p}{2} \pmod{p} \text{ if } p \text{ is even},$$
$$k^*q \equiv \frac{p+1}{2} \pmod{p} \text{ if } p \text{ is odd}.$$

Hence the optimal value of $\tilde{\theta}$ is given by

$$\tilde{\theta}(q/p) = \cos\Big(\frac{2\pi k^* q}{p}\Big) = \cos(\pi) = -1, \qquad \text{if } p \text{ is even},$$
$$\tilde{\theta}(q/p) = \cos\Big(\frac{2\pi k^* q}{p}\Big) = \cos\Big(\pi + \frac{\pi}{p}\Big) = -\cos\Big(\frac{\pi}{p}\Big), \qquad \text{if } p \text{ is odd}.$$

If $s_0 \in \mathbb{Q}_o$, then any sequence $s_j \to s_0$ with $s_j \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ has

$$\tilde{\theta}(s_0) - \tilde{\theta}(s_j) = \tilde{\theta}(s_0) + 1 > \delta > 0, \text{ for some } \delta.$$

Hence $\tilde{\theta}(s)$ is discontinuous at $\mathbb{Q}_o$.

For continuity at a point $s_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$, let $\epsilon > 0$. Clearly for any $s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$,

$$|\tilde{\theta}(s) - \tilde{\theta}(s_0)| = 0 < \epsilon.$$

To examine the behavior of $s \in \mathbb{Q}_o$, fix $t = \lceil \epsilon^{-1} \rceil$ as the smallest integer larger than ϵ^{-1}. Note that there are only a finite number of rational numbers q/p with $p \leq t$ (and greatest common divisor $\gcd(q,p) = 1$) in the interval $s_0 - 1 < q/p < s_0 + 1$. Hence one can take, $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ small enough so that any rational number with $p > t$ satisfies $|s_0 - q/p| < \delta$. Consequently for any rational $q/p \in \mathbb{Q}_o$:

$$\implies \left|\tilde{\theta}(q/p) - \tilde{\theta}(s_0)\right| = \left|\cos\left(\pi + \frac{\pi}{p}\right) - \cos(\pi)\right| \leq \frac{\pi}{p} \leq \frac{\pi}{t} \leq \pi\epsilon.$$

In the last line we have used a Lipschitz constant of 1 for cosine, however this bound can easily be sharpened to $\leq Cp^{-2}$. This concludes the proof. □

If $\theta(s)$ were nowhere continuous, then the minimizer s^* to $E(s)$ would always be rational. As a result of (9.4), $E(s)$ can have irrational minimizers at s^* only if $W(s)$ is sharply dipped at s^*. Moreover, if $W(s)$ is smooth enough, s^* must be rational.

Proposition 9.5. *Suppose $W(s)$ has bounded second derivative on $(0,1)$ and $s^* \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$. Then s^* does not minimize $E(s)$.*

Proof. We first argue that if $s^* \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$ and minimizes E, then s^* must also minimize W. Using a density argument, if $s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$ then $E(s) = \frac{1}{4}(W(s) + W(0))$. Hence, if $W(s^*) > W(s_0)$ for some s_0, then by continuity of W one can fine an $s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ close to s_0 with $E(s) < E(s^*)$. Assume now that $s^* \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_e$ minimizes E. Since $s^* \neq 0$ also minimizes W, it follows that $W'(s^*) = 0$. Hence, by Taylor's remainder theorem, for any s in the neighborhood of s^*, there exists a constant C such that

$$|W(s) - W(s^*)| \leq C|s - s^*|^2.$$

We now argue that one can find a rational point close to s^* that has lower energy. Using basic properties of cosine, as well as the result from proposition 9.4, one has for any rational point $q/p \in \mathbb{Q}_o$ in the neighborhood of s^*, there exists a $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\left|\tilde{\theta}(q/p) - \tilde{\theta}(s^*)\right| = \left|\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{p} + \pi\right) - \cos(\pi)\right| \geq \frac{c_1}{p^2}.$$

Now consider a sequence of approximating rational points $s_j = q_j/p_j \to s^*$, for $j > 0$ with $s_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ that by a well-known theorem from continued fractions satisfy

$$\left|\frac{q_j}{p_j} - s^*\right| \leq \frac{c_2}{p_j^2}.$$

An important remark, is that the sequence of p_j generated via continued fractions have p_j odd infinitely often. Therefore, without loss of generality we may restrict the sequence s_j to a sub-sequence on $\mathbb{Q}_o$ that has p_j odd[8].

[8] An infinite continued fraction can be represented as a unique sequence of positive integers $(a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots)$. The rational $s_j = q_j/p_j$ approximations satisfy the recursion relations $q_0 = a_0$, $p_0 = 1$, $q_1 = a_1 a_0 + 1$, $p_1 = a_1$, and $q_j = a_j q_{j-1} + q_{j-2}, p_j = a_j p_{j-1} + p_{j-2}$, for $j \geq 2$. Therefore using an induction argument, one can show that if (p_{j-1}, p_j) has at least one odd term, then (p_{j+1}, p_{j+2}) also has one odd term. Since $(p_0, p_1) = (1, a_1)$, the result follows.

Hence, combining the previous two inequalities, on this sequence $s_j \in \mathbb{Q}_o$

$$\big|\theta(s_j) - \theta(s^*)\big| \geq c_3 \big|s_j - s^*\big|.$$

By direct calculation, for j sufficiently large,

$$E(s_j) - E(s^*) = \theta(s_j)\Big(W(s_j) - W(s^*)\Big) + \Big(\theta(s_j) - \theta(s^*)\Big)\Big(W(s^*) - W(0)\Big), \tag{9.8}$$

$$\leq A_1|s_j - s^*|^2 - A_2|s_j - s^*|, \tag{9.9}$$

where $A_1 > 0$ is an upper bound on $\theta(s_j)$ and the Taylor constant, $A_2 = c_3(W(0) - W(s^*)) > 0$. Finally, for sufficiently large j one has $A_2|s_j - s^*| > A_1|s_j - s^*|^2$ implying

$$E(s_j) < E(s^*).$$

Thus, s^* cannot minimize $E(s)$. □

The purpose of 9.5 is to observe that if $W(s)$ is smooth enough on $(0, 1)$, then minimizes must have rational spacings.

Appendix C: Recovery when F_R is a collection of Dirac-δ distributions

An important recovery case arises when F_R is a collection of $m > 0$, Dirac-δ distributions at locations $\mathbf{s} \in S$ with strictly positive weights $f_R(\mathbf{s}) > 0$, where $S := \{\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_{m-1}\} \subset \Omega$:

$$F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} f_R(\mathbf{s})\ \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}), \qquad \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} f_R(\mathbf{s}) = 1, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \tag{9.10}$$

In this case F_R is completely identified by the discrete set S and corresponding set function $f_R : S \to \mathbb{R}$. The recovery ρ^* can then be computed using a discrete analog of the continuous energy (4.1) along with a discrete version of Schulz-Snyder. A few preliminary details are required for a precise formulation of the recovery.

In this section we make the following assumption regarding the points $\mathbf{s} \in S$:

Assumption 9.6. *The Dirac distribution points $\mathbf{s} \in S$ are commensurate with a lattice that is periodic in Ω. The points $\mathbf{s} \in S$ need not form a lattice, however the spacing between any pair of points in S must be integer multiples of lattice vectors. Namely, there exist d lattice*[9] *vectors $\mathbf{v}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, such that for every coordinate pair $(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{s}_j) \subseteq S \times S$, there are integers $n_{ij}^l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq l \leq d$ (depending on $\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{s}_j$) so that the difference*

$$\mathbf{s}_i - \mathbf{s}_j = \sum_{l=1}^{d} n_{ij}^l \mathbf{v}_l. \tag{9.11}$$

[9]The vectors may or may not be primitive in the sense of spanning the smallest lattice to contain the points $\mathbf{s}_j$.

Additionally, the lattice is periodic in Ω if every integer shift $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ can be written as a linear combination of vectors $\mathbf{v}^l$ with integer weights $n_{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\mathbf{t} = \sum_{l=1}^{d} n_{\mathbf{t}}^l \mathbf{v}_l. \tag{9.12}$$

Remark 13. *The assumption 9.6 is taken from observations regarding the discrete numerical solutions to problem (R). A partial explanation of the assumption is given in appendix 9 where the assumption is verified for a small subclass of solutions in dimension one.*

The following additional property regarding F_R will aid in defining a periodic lattice that contains the support of F_R.

Proposition 9.7. *A distribution $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ of the form (9.10) that solves (R), has support at the origin $\mathbf{x} = 0$: namely $\mathbf{0} \in S$ so that $f_R(\mathbf{0}) > 0$.*

Proof. We prove the following stronger result in $d = 1$. Let $f_0 = f_R(0) \geq 0$ be the weight of $\delta(x)$ in $F_R(x)$ (which we allow to be 0). Then $f_0 \geq f_1$ for any point $s_1 \in [0, 1]$ with corresponding weight $f_1 = f_R(s_1)$. The proof follows from a straightforward fact regarding Fourier series with non-negative coefficients. Suppose by contradiction that some point $s_1 \in \Omega = [0, 1]$ has weight f_1 with $f_0 - f_1 < -\epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Take N large enough and σ small enough so that the bump function

$$B_\sigma(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \Lambda_\sigma e^{-k^2\sigma^2} \cos(2\pi k x), \tag{9.13}$$

is close enough to $e^{-\frac{x^2}{\sigma^2}}$ to ensure that the test function $\phi(x) = B_\sigma(x) - B_\sigma(x - s_1)$ satisfies $|f_0 - f_1 - \langle F_R(x), \phi(x)\rangle| < \epsilon/2$. Consequently, a direct calculation

$$-\frac{\epsilon}{2} > \langle F_R(x), \phi(x)\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \langle F_R(x), \cos(2\pi k x)\rangle \Lambda_\sigma e^{-k^2/\sigma^2}(1 - \cos(2\pi k s)) \geq 0,$$

yields the required contraction. Extending the one dimensional argument by tensor products to higher dimensions implies that $f_R(\mathbf{0}) \geq f_R(\mathbf{s})$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in S$. Finally, the mass constraint in $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ ensures that $f_R(\mathbf{0}) > 0$ so that $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ has support at $\mathbf{0}$. □

In light of 9.6-9.7, we define a lattice χ using the vectors $\mathbf{v}^l$ from assumption 9.6:

$$\chi := \Big\{ \mathbf{y} \in \Omega : \mathbf{y} = \sum_{l=1}^{d} n^l \mathbf{v}_l, \text{ for all } n^l \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq l \leq d \Big\}. \tag{9.14}$$

The discrete lattice $\chi \subset \Omega$ then has the following properties:

- $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0} \in \chi$ follows directly from the definition of χ.
- The set χ contains all points in S: $S \subseteq \chi$. Using proposition 9.7, $\mathbf{0} \in S$. From assumption 9.6, every other point $\mathbf{s} \in S$ can be written as $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0} + \sum_{l=1}^{d} n^l \mathbf{v}^l \in \chi$.

- For any points $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \chi$, the vector addition $\mathbf{y}_1 + \mathbf{y}_2 \mod \Omega \in \chi$, and $\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2 \mod \Omega \in \chi$. Here $\mod \Omega$, means the vector sum (or difference) $\mathbf{y}_1 + \mathbf{y}_2$ is taken on the periodic domain Ω: i.e. $(0.2, 0.2) + (0.9, 0.7) = (0.1, 0.9) \mod [0, 1]^2$.

- Given any two set functions g, h defined on χ, $g, h : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$, the discrete cross-correlations, $g \circ h : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$, are also set functions defined on χ:

$$(g \circ h)(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \chi} g(\mathbf{x}) h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}), \text{ holds for all } \mathbf{s} \in \chi.$$

Now extend $f_R(\mathbf{s})$ in (9.10) from S to the lattice χ so that $F_R(\mathbf{x})$ is written as

$$F_R(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \chi} f_R(\mathbf{s}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}), \quad \text{where } f_R(\mathbf{s}) = 0, \text{ if } \mathbf{s} \in \chi \setminus S, \tag{9.15}$$

In the discrete recovery case, $\rho^*(\mathbf{x})$ is taken as a distribution of the form

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \chi} r(\mathbf{s}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}), \qquad \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in S} r(\mathbf{s}) = 1, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

where $r(\mathbf{s}) \geq 0$ and $r : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$ is a set function. It is interesting to note that $r(\mathbf{s})$ is finite dimensional so that the recovery reduces to a finite dimensional optimization problem.

Given the set function $f_R : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to F_R in (9.10), the Kullback-Leibler energy defined over set functions $r : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(r) &:= \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \chi} f_R(\mathbf{s}) \ln \Big(\frac{f_R(\mathbf{s})}{f_r(\mathbf{s})} \Big) = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \chi} f_R(\mathbf{s}) \ln \Big(\frac{f_R(\mathbf{s})}{r \circ r} \Big), \\ f_r(\mathbf{x}) &= r \circ r = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \chi} r(\mathbf{x}) r(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}). \end{aligned} \tag{9.16}$$

Again the conventions (4.2) are used to allow for values of 0 in both f_R and f_r. From here, the discrete recovery formulation parallels the continuous case where the functions F_R and ρ are replaced with set function f_R and r, and integrals are replaced with discrete summations.

Discrete Recovery Algorithm (Schulz-Snyder)

0. Identify the set χ from the set S.

1. Initialize the set function $r_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \chi$ to be strictly positive with $\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\chi} r_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$. Ensure that r_0 has no planes of symmetry: for any fixed vector $\mathbf{a}$, the shifted r_0 is not even symmetric, there exists one $\mathbf{x} \in \chi$ with $r_0(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{x}) \neq r_0(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a})$.

2. Iterate the discrete mapping:

$$r_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) = r_n(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\chi} r_n(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}) \frac{f_R(\mathbf{y})}{f_{r_n}(\mathbf{y})}, \text{ where } f_{r_n}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\chi} r_n(\mathbf{x}) r_n(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{s}),$$

or $\quad f_{r_n}(\mathbf{x}) = r_n \circ r_n$, and we have used the fact that $f_R(\mathbf{y}) = f_R(-\mathbf{y})$.

3. Take $r^*(\mathbf{s}) = r_\infty(\mathbf{s})$ for $\mathbf{s} \in \chi$, and set $\rho^*(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\chi} r^*(\mathbf{s})\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s})$, as the candidate global minimizer to (P).

References

[1] A. Ahmed, B. Recht, and J. Romberg, *Blind deconvolution using convex programming*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 60 (2013), pp. 1711–1732.

[2] B. Ames and S. Vavasis, *Convex optimization for the planted k-disjoint-clique problem*, Mathematical Programming, 143, pp. 299–337.

[3] D. Balagué, J. Carrillo, T. Laurent, and G. Raoul, *Dimensionality of local minimizers of the interaction energy*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 209 (2013), pp. 1055–1088.

[4] A. Bernoff and C. Topaz, *Nonlocal aggregation models: A primer of swarm equilibria*, SIAM Review, 55 (2013), pp. 709–747.

[5] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[6] E. Candès and X. Li, *Solving quadratic equations via phaselift when there are about as many equations as unknowns*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 14, pp. 1017–1026.

[7] E. Candès, X. Li, and M. Soltanolkotabi, *Phase retrieval via wirtinger flow: Theory and algorithms*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 61 (2015), pp. 1985–2007.

[8] E. Candès and T. Tao, *The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 56 (2010), pp. 2053–2080.

[9] R. Choksi, R. Fetecau, and I. Topaloglu, *On minimizers of interaction functionals with competing attractive and repulsive potentials*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, (2015).

[10] M. A. Cotter, *Hard spherocylinders in an anisotropic mean field: A simple model for a nematic liquid crystal*, J. Chem. Phys., 66 (1977).

[11] K. Craig and I. Topaloglu, *Convergence of regularized nonlocal interaction energies*, 2015. http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.04826.

[12] L. Demanet and P. Hand, *Scaling law for recovering the sparsest element in a subspace*, Information and Inference, 3 (2014), pp. 295–309.

[13] M. Emelianenko, Z.-K. Liu, and Q. Du, *A new algorithm for the automation of phase diagram calculation*, Comp. Mater. Sci., 35 (2006), pp. 61–74.

[14] C. Floudas, *Deterministic global optimization, theory, methods and applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.

[15] M. Goemans and D. Williamson, *Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming*, Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery, 42 (1995), pp. 1115–1145.

[16] A. S. H. Cohn, A. Kumar, *Ground states and formal duality relations in the Gaussian core model*, Physical Review E, 80 (2009).

[17] J.-P. Harvey, G. Eriksson, D. Orban, and P. Chartrand, *Global minimization of the gibbs energy of multicomponent systems involving the presence of order/disorder phase transitions*, American Journal of Science, 313 (2013), pp. 199–241.

[18] M. Holmes-Cerfon, S. J. Gortler, and M. P. Brenner, *A geometrical approach to computing energy landscapes from short-ranged potentials*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 110 (2013).

[19] K. Jaganathan, S. Oymak, and B. Hassibi, *Recovery of sparse 1d signals from the magnitudes of their fourier transform*, 2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings, (2012).

[20] R. Lai, J. Liu, and S. Osher, *Density matrix minimization with ℓ_1 regularization*, Commun. Math. Sci., 13 (2015), pp. 2097–2117.

[21] E. Lieb and M. Loss, *Analysis*, vol. 14, American Mathematical Society, second ed., 2001.

[22] M. Locatelli and F. Schoen, *Efficient algorithms for large scale global optimization: Lennard-Jones clusters*, Computat. Optim. and App. archive, 26 (2003), pp. 173–190.

[23] ——, *Global optimization: Theory, algorithms and applications*, SIAM, 2013.

[24] C. D. Maranas and C. A. Floudas, *Global minimum potential energy conformations of small molecules*, J. Glob. Optim., 4 (1994), pp. 135–170.

[25] E. Marcotte, F. Stillingerb, and S. Torquato, *Optimized monotonic convex pair potentials stabilize low-coordinated crystals*, Soft Matter, 7 (2011).

[26] A. Mogilner, L. Edelstein-Keshet, L. Bent, and A. Spiros, *Mutual interactions, potentials, and individual distance in a social aggregation*, J. Math. Biol., 47 (2003), pp. 353–389.

[27] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor, *Heterophilious dynamics enhances consensus*, SIAM Review, 56 (2014), pp. 577–621.

[28] Y. Nesterov, H. Wolkowicz, and Y. Ye, *Semidefinite Programming Relaxations of Nonconvex Quadratic Optimization*, vol. 27, Springer, 2000, ch. 13, pp. 361–419. Chapter in Handbook of Semidefinite Programming.

[29] M. Nouralishahi, C. Wu, and L. Vandenberghe, *Model calibration for optical lithography via semidefinite programming*, Optimization and Engineering, 9 (2008), pp. 19–35.

[30] Onsager, *The effects of shape on the interaction of colloidal particles*, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., 51 (1949), pp. 627–659.

[31] M. Pinsker, *Information and Information Stability of Random Variables and Processes*, Holden-Day, 1964.

[32] M. Rechtsman, F. Stillinger, and S. Torquato, *Optimized interactions for targeted self-assembly: Application to a honeycomb lattice*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 95 (2005).

[33] E. Saff and V. Totik, *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, vol. 316, Springer, 1997.

[34] A. S. Schneider, C. J. Horowitz, J. Hughto, and D. K. Berry, *Nuclear pasta formation*, Phys. Rev. C, 88 (2013).

[35] T. Schulz and D. Snyder, *Image recovery from correlations*, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, 9 (1992), pp. 1266–1272.

[36] T. Schulz and D. Voelz, *Signal recovery from autocorrelation and cross-correlation data*, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, 22 (2005), pp. 616–624.

[37] D. Shirokoff, R. Choksi, and J.-C. Nave, *Sufficient conditions for global minimality of metastable states in a class of non-convex functionals: A simple approach via quadratic lower bounds*, Journal of Nonlinear Science, 25 (2015), pp. 539–582.

[38] R. Simione, D. Slepčev, and I. Topaloglu, *Existence of ground states of nonlocal-interaction energies*, J. Stat. Phys., 159 (2015), pp. 972–986.

[39] A. Sütő, *Crystalline ground states for classical particles*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 95 (2005).

[40] ——, *From bcc to fcc: Interplay between oscillating long-range and repulsive short-range forces*, Phys. Rev. B, 74 (2006).

[41] ——, *Ground state at high density*, Commun. Math. Phys., 305 (2011), pp. 657–710.

[42] S. Torquato, *Necessary conditions on realizable two-point correlation functions of random media*, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 45 (2006), pp. 6923–6928.

[43] R. Vanderbei, *Fast Fourier optimization*, Math Programming Computation, 4(1) (2012), pp. 53–69.

[44] J. von Brecht, D. Uminsky, T. Kolokolnikov, and A. Bertozzi, *Predicting pattern formation in particle interactions*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 31 (2012).

[45] I. Waldspurger, A. d'Aspremont, and S. Mallat, *Phase recovery, maxcut and complex semidefinite programming*, Mathematical Programming, 149 (2015), pp. 47–81.

[46] X. R. Wang, J. M. Miller, J. Lizier, M. Prokopenko, and L. Rossi, *Quantifying and tracing information cascades in swarms*, PLoS ONE, 7 (2012).